

NO MORE DISSENT

#12

29 April 1968

San Diego State

I'M ALL RIGHT JACK

Some have relied on what they knew;

Others on being simply true.

What worked for them might work for you. - Robert Frost

Recently a psychology professor at a West Coast university divided his class in an introductory course into two large groups. One group was informed of the text and the examination dates and told to leave and to come back only for the examinations. The other group attended class meetings as usual. The professor considered himself an enthusiastic and effective lecturer and a skillful discussion leader within the Socratic tradition. He wanted to test his effectiveness. As you might have already guessed, the examination resulted in the group which did not attend class scoring significantly higher than the group which did. Furthermore, a follow-up study two years later showed that more of the "non-attendance" group had selected psychology for a major and their grades in advanced psychology classes were better than students from the "attendance" group.

About two years ago, a very popular young philosophy professor at Yale was denied tenure. In a stirring display of loyalty, Yale students picketed on his behalf, walking briskly back and forth in the snow in front of national TV cameras. Meanwhile, in a book-lined and paneled-with-real-planks office, also in front of national TV cameras, the silver-haired department chairman, first, and then the silver-haired dean, explained patiently (and without any guile whatsoever) that the young professor had failed to write a book of high quality. (The professor had written a book, but the reviews were not encouraging.) The chairman and the dean both explained very logically and calmly the "publish or perish" policy of the university, while outside in the snow, the students chanted their opposition.

The implicit connection between the above two paragraphs is that while we stand arguing with one another regarding "teaching" versus "research," we may all be gathered up and placed on a reservation with the condor, the buffalo, or the Mohicans. No matter whether we belong to the one-upmanship gang (I have published more than you, I am more radical than you, or my degree is from a better school than yours is) or the blessed-are-the-teachers-of-men gang (my time is your time, a funny thing happened on my way back from the commons, or to put it more simply), we all hate schools of education. One reason may be that those who investigate the learning process may not be entirely incompetent or entirely on the wrong track. In other words, they may eventually become our judges, jury, and executioners.

The bright students know the system is largely nonsense, but they have done little to change it. Many professors and administrators know that the system of higher education is riddled with absurdities and bound to ineffectiveness, but for one reason or another they learn to live with it. Higher education is unlikely to reform itself. And, until recently, there has been very little likelihood that any exterior force could cross the sacred river of academic freedom, scale the wall of hypocrisy, silence the guns of rationalization, and invade and conquer the inner sanctuary of sanctified self-interest.

However--and the metaphor goes on and on--a Trojan horse of sorts has appeared on the horizon. In the forefront are educational psychologists, riding their flashing computers and waving their self-teaching, teacher-proof texts in one hand and their empirical measurements in the other. Following closely behind on foot, are superintendents and school principals who are armed with flexible or free scheduling, student-learning responsibility, teaching machines, and small-group seminars. Above them wave the banners of the New Math, the New English, the New Science, and the cryptic sign of the earphone. The host pulls the wooden horse to the gates and leaves.

The following morning, Professor Widdleheifer begins his first lecture of a new school

year. Peering down over his dark glasses, he begins, slightly bored and barely audible, to read his carefully researched notes. Next door, Professor Lumplachen, tugging gently at his liberal beard, launches his first chuckle of the year, a little joke to show his students that he too is human. Suddenly, as if on cue, all the students in both classrooms rise to their feet. "You're joking!" they exclaim as they turn and file out the door. Even the ones who just came to get their union cards.

- J. J. Benson

A REQUEST OF THE FACULTY

For the past two semesters, a Big Brother program has been in operation at San Diego State. It has been maintained by various campus organizations for the purpose of making a child's life a little more bearable. I feel we are really creating understanding through communicating and have brought meaning to the word "brotherhood."

We would like members of our faculty to take a child into their family settings by including a disadvantaged child in regular family outings and activities. Some of the children have extreme emotional problems and they need to get out of their environment even if only for a little while.

The children in this program are in four categories: juvenile delinquents, parent-neglected children, mentally retarded children, and mostly fatherless children. The children, both girls and boys, range in age from five to fourteen. If you are interested in participating in this program or wish further information, please call Jane Poroy at 460-7372. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

- J. Minkin
Project Coordinator

THE FORGOTTEN FACULTY

In recent years, San Diego State, like most modern colleges and universities, has been creating a new type of faculty member, and more and more of the teaching load is being shifted to his or her shoulders. This new junior professor is the Teaching Assistant.

But the average TA on campus is untenured and transitory, underpaid and inexperienced. He is usually a graduate student, has little bargaining power on campus, is usually strictly dictated to by departmental hierarchy, and is not guaranteed the right to academic freedom by present college regulations. Though they fill an indispensable role, the TAs are the forgotten faculty.

Growing enrollments, rising costs of higher education, and reluctance on the part of professors to teach elementary undergraduate classes are forcing the college to lean more and more on the TA. But there is a great need for improving the lot of the TA and the quality of his teaching.

This is the picture of the condition of the average TA at San Diego State as I see it:

- + He generally has a low estimate of himself, looking upon his position as cheap help. He often thinks that this status is the price he must pay for the privilege of doing graduate work.

- + He teaches an increasing percentage of the daytime classes and a substantial percentage of a student's undergraduate credit now involves the use of TAs. Some TAs teach up to 9 hours and often take as many as 12 hours toward their advanced degree.

- + The salaries TAs receive for their work is disproportionately low compared to their importance to a department.

- + Few departments have senior faculty members specifically appointed to assist in the training of TAs.

+ The office space for a TA is most often crowded and inadequate, frequently with a single desk shared by as many as six TAs.

I have not been able to find any effort on the part of either the Senate or the Administration to improve this situation. Most of what happens to the TAs is a matter of arbitrary decision, or blind necessity, it appears, rather than official policy.

A public airing of the problem of treatment of TAs is necessary. What we need is:
1) a standard by which department chairmen might measure their own treatment of TAs; 2) an improvement program, perhaps even seminars for helping TAs upgrade their professionalism; 3) an investigation into the recruitment, retention, and salaries of TAs (some are obviously housewives hired at the last minute, left hanging from one semester to the next, and paid whatever is left over); 4) an increase of respect for the TAs among senior faculty members, even inclusion of TAs in department decision-making.

How do the TAs themselves feel about their jobs? From what I can tell, most of them are not willing to speak out. They would rather submit quietly to whatever indignities come their way. After all, many are working hard on their own advanced degree, and some of their grades must come from the very men they would have to criticize. Most significantly, they seem to feel that nobody is very much worried about their condition. They are indispensable but forgotten.

- K. Keller

IL CONSPIRATORE; or, IF MUSIC BE THE FOOD OF LOVE, PLAY ON . . .

A Melodrama in Three Acts

Music by Q. Ignoto, Libretto by M. Carella

From a Farce by I. Senatori

Cast of Characters (in order of appearance):

Malvoglio, anthropologist	(baritone)
Benevolente, missionary	(tenor)
Il Maestro	(basso)
della Gioia, witch doctor	(basso profondo)
Argilla, kingpin	(tenor)
Primitiva, vestal bopper	(soprano)

THE ARGUMENT. The scene of our story is laid in the mythical island kingdom of Finzione, hidden away in the South Seas far from shipping lanes and from the cares and worries of civilization. Its only contact with the outside world has been a missionary and an anthropologist. The former is a one-time notorious libertine who found religion and has been sent to the island by his congregation in hopes that he might atone for his sins by preaching the gospel of love to these primitive savages. The anthropologist, a life-long Ph.D. candidate, was enticed by his thesis director into joining an expedition to another island, was ship-wrecked short of his intended destination, and now harbors grave doubt about the myth of the noble savage. The time is the week before elections to the tribal council. Though their taboos are weird and their customs unusual to the civilized, these natives love to indulge in politics, that game that knows no distinction between the primitive and the mature, the savage and the civilized.

As the overture ends, Malvoglio steps forward into the single spotlight and sings the Prologue aria "Queste cose ridicolose" ("These foolish things remind me . . ."), in which he describes how for more than a decade the Duke has reigned firmly but lovingly over this tribe in spite of--though many claim because of--the existence of numerous factions. Though only a minority, the royalist party has managed--through seniority, a mastery of parliamentary procedures and a judicious use of patronage--to exert effective control over the tribe. The fact that royalist cabinet ministers constitute a sizable bloc of the voting members of the Council also helps. Recently, however, a proposed change in the constitution of the council threatens to upset the delicate balance of power by depriving

the ministers of their vote. The proposed amendment has become the source of a major controversy.

ACT ONE opens in the council-hut as members of the council are furiously debating the amendment. Il Maestro, one of the royalist elders, has risen to attack it. He sings the aria, "Non lasciare la tradizione. . ." ("Don't rock the boat"), a moving defense of the old order, a plea for understanding, and a call for reconsideration. His plea is punctuated by jeers from the proponents of the amendment ("I giovani Turchi") who sing the chorus "Vinciamo" ("We shall overcome"). Before a vote can be taken, della Gioia rises and intones the solemn "Pianissimo" ("O so slowly!"), in which he tells how successful the present constitution has been and how it should not be overthrown in haste. Perhaps in a few years . . . Besides, he warns, Dum-Dum, high-priest of the god of fire and of vengeance, will look with grave disfavor upon the tribe and call down the wrath of heaven upon them. The mention of Dum-Dum and the god of fire causes trepidation in the ranks of the proponents. Vainly, Argilla, their leader, attempts to counter della Gioia as he sings "Crederete. . ." ("Would you believe?") warning that the natives are restless. But all is for naught. The amendment is defeated and the meeting adjourned. As the council members file out, a group of proponents gathers in the foyer to discuss strategy. Benevolente tries to calm them, saying that anger is uncivilized--that they lost fair and square. The young turks are not put off. They decide on a popular referendum and ACT ONE ends with the sextet "Al popolo."

As ACT TWO opens, the referendum is over, and contrary to expectation, the proponents have won. To the left of stage, they are celebrating their narrow victory. We hear their drinking song, "Vuostare bene" ("Vote early, vote often"). When the chorus is over, the scene shifts to the right of the stage where the royalists, stunned by their narrow defeat, have gathered to commiserate. They sing the dirge-like "Non possiamo contemplar . . ." Suddenly Il Maestro announces that they are not defeated--that the council need not accept the results of the referendum.

The scene shifts to the council-hut. The original plan of the royalists has failed. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of confusion about who can or cannot vote. Suddenly, Primitiva, vestal-bopper in the temple of the god of fire, bursts in on the assembly. She has read in the eternal flame that burns in the temple the displeasure of the gods. She sings the ominous "Viene il giudice" ("Here come the judge"), charging that a fraud has been perpetrated and that doom is imminent. Her plea falls on deaf ears. The council meeting is adjourned.

The scene shifts to a small hut where a band of revolutionaries is conspiring to overthrow the Duke. Suddenly, a hooded figure enters. It is Il Conspiratore, leader of the conspiracy. He tells them that their plan will fail if the proposed amendment stands. He sings the aria "Una mezza rivoluzione" ("Half a revolution is worse than no revolution at all"), wherein he proposes that they support a counter-referendum reestablishing the former constitution. As the conspirators disband, he removes his hood revealing Il Maestro.

As ACT THREE opens, a considerable length of time has passed without any evidence of impending disaster. Interest in a counter-referendum has waned. To restimulate interest the conspirators have urged the royalists to have a torchlight rally on the eve of the election. Il Maestro has convinced the royalists that should the amendment fail, Primitiva must be sacrificed to the god of fire. At the rally, numerous speeches exhorting the people to reinstate the constitution are delivered. A chorus of royalists sings the rousing march "L'uve amare . . ." ("Sour grapes"). Confident of victory, Primitiva has allowed herself to be placed over the burning pyre outside the temple. Suddenly, word comes that the counter-amendment has failed by a decisive vote. "The gods will be angry," she cries. But the Royalists, bent on propitiating the god of fire, have vowed to sacrifice in the fire as she intones the aria "Non pensavo mai. . ." ("I never dreamed"), and hurls herself onto the pyre. Curtain.

A POSITION PAPER

It is with great regret that the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges finds it necessary to issue the following statement to its colleagues in the California State Colleges, but it cannot in good conscience do otherwise.

It is now clear that, in addition to financial strangulation, the California State Colleges face a mounting assault upon the very conception of a free and intellectually open higher education in the State of California. This assault is rendered all the more dangerous in that it is basically *political* in nature, and many politicians themselves are entering into it, moved undoubtedly by the conviction that it is politically realistic to do so. Significantly, few voices among concerned legislators have been raised, either to defend the State Colleges or to identify the attack for what it is -- political.

The assault upon public higher education can be seen in its beginning stages in such facts and events as the following:

1. The humiliating "hearing" at which President John Summerskill of San Francisco State College and other college presidents were in effect tried publicly while the leaders of the Democratic and Republican parties--attending their first Trustee meeting of the year--demonstrated by their very presence how much higher education has become a political football in California. Subsequently, President Summerskill resigned after having been "cleared" by a Trustee committee.
2. The passing by the Board of Trustees of new regulations for campus discipline at the meeting of December 9, 1967. These regulations were modified at the meeting of January 25, 1968, in Sonoma, but only by a 10:7 vote.
3. The furious local attacks mounted against various State College presidents and faculty. These attacks can be expected to increase in size and intensity.
4. The Legislative committee hearings on "The Beard" at Fullerton, with the accompanying cries for dismissal of faculty and President.
5. The introduction of bills and resolutions into the Legislature which would, among other things:
 - a) Make the presidents responsible--i.e., dischargeable or replaceable--for every single decision made on campus. This bill specifically prohibits delegation of final decision-making authority "to any employee below the rank of president of a state college."
 - b) Withhold funds from the State Colleges until the Trustees re-establish the regulations of December 9, 1967, modified at Sonoma.
 - c) Change the appointment mechanism of Trustees to require reconfirmation after four years by two-thirds of the California Senate and to provide that "Any appointive trustee may be removed from office at any time during his term by a two-thirds vote of all members elected to the Senate."

(Two bills are involved here. They would result in the most obvious political control of the State Colleges. The Trustees are already vulnerable without making them more so. It is bad enough that Trustee appointments typically are and have been largely rewards for political favors, but, however, chosen, the Trustees are entitled to some freedom from political pressure afterward.)

 - d) Open all student organization and faculty organization meetings on campus to the press and the public. The classroom itself is not expressly excluded, and this bill, in conjunction with SB 419, might permit invasion of the classroom so that any suspected student or faculty member could more easily be spied upon.

- e) Make mandatory (rather than permissive) the dismissal of faculty members or nonacademic employees convicted of felony or misdemeanor "involving moral turpitude or breach of the peace," or "addicted to the use of narcotics or any other habit-forming drugs." There is no clear legal definition of the term *breach of the peace*. The Legislators would here apply standards to others which they do not apply to themselves.
- f) Extend the present tenure period of four years to five years.
- g) Delete from the definition of "obscene" the phrase "and is a matter which is utterly without redeeming social importance." This deletion, in addition to abrogating U.S. Supreme Court decisions, would place professors of literature, art, drama, psychology, biology, etc., in a dangerous position.
- h) Weaken the *de facto* role of faculty participation in the appointment of college presidents by stressing Trustee responsibility. Regardless of consultation, "the trustees shall have and assume the final and sole responsibility. . . ."
- i) Remove from the college president discretion to decide whether a person, other than a student, officer or employee, etc., who enters the campus and "commits thereon an act likely to interfere with peaceful conduct of activities of campus or enters for the purpose of committing such act" is guilty of misdemeanor. The unsaid question posed by this bill is, "Who would decide?" The Trustees? The local police? Anyone?
- j) Provide for a new California State College Police Department which would *not* be under the control of the various presidents of the state colleges. The Director of it "shall be appointed by the Trustees of the California State Colleges and shall serve under and be directly responsible to the Chancellor of the California State Colleges. He shall supervise and direct operations of the department throughout the state."

(The faculties may judge whether they would feel comfortable or apprehensive under a system whereby a virtually autonomous police authority, uncontrolled by the president, existed on campus.)

Rather than undertake a bill-by-bill refutation, or a bill-by-bill recommendation, the Academic Senate thinks it wiser to point out to the faculties the *common effect* of these bills, namely, greater political control of the California State Colleges. There can be no doubt of the attempt to bring the California State Colleges under more rigorous political control.

The common justification for these attacks is the vague argument: "The taxpayers of California support the State Colleges, and, therefore, the Colleges must be responsible to the taxpayers." As an abstract statement, this dictum has everyone's agreement. Of course, the Colleges are responsible to the taxpayers, but for *what* are they responsible, and *how* shall they be responsible to the taxpayer?

As to the first part of this question, the State Colleges are responsible for producing a highly trained and a generally or liberally educated person who becomes a productive and enlightened part of the State of California. The condition of California in the past twenty years would indicate that the product has been rather good.

As to the second part of the question, it is obvious that the attackers do not regard the "power of the purse" as a sufficient means of accountability. They tend to confuse *accountability to pressure groups* and their legislative representatives with *responsibility to the taxpayers*. They are not the same thing. Far less will the *interests* of the people as a whole be served by such measures as are proposed.

The attackers propose bills and suggest action which in practice would simply make the colleges subservient to various pressure groups or to whatever political wind happens to be blowing strongest. This is not responsibility to the taxpayer. It is control by organized groups seeking to impose their orthodoxy upon the colleges. And if the organizational pattern is so set up as to allow those groups to exert great political pressure upon the colleges -- and this is the obvious effect of the above bills -- then the educational system is in a perilous condition. Thought-control could be the end result.

In Europe, our traditional ancestor, Boards of Regents or Trustees were appointed to protect the universities from political interference. The men were carefully chosen with that object in mind. This is still the case in Western Europe, from whence our own democratic traditions derive. Unfortunately, this part of our common tradition has, with the exception of a few private colleges, never completely caught on in this country. As Robert Hutchins says of strict academic controls by legislative and executive branches of government, "Americans tend to think these practices are normal and necessary. As a matter of fact, they are peculiar to this country. Neither boards of trustees nor the parliaments of the United Kingdom or any European country would think of interfering in any academic matter. This is so even though the taxpayers are in most of these countries the sole source of university support." What the State Colleges clearly confront is attack by certain groups who apparently do not agree with their own tradition. With respect to academic governance, it is the colleges who are the conservatives and the attackers who are the radicals.

There are, of course, in the Legislature many men who understand the foregoing quite well and who are deeply sympathetic to the cause of public higher education. But their voices have been largely muted because they themselves are under continuous political attack.

The Academic Senate feels that it would be impossible to deny that public higher education is under political attack in California. We in the academic community must accept it as a fact of life, and our acceptance of this fact moves us to make an observation and a recommendation to our colleagues:

1. We recognize very sadly that, because of the persistence of these attacks and because they are increasing in scope and intensity, many of our colleagues are giving serious thought to the prospect of moving elsewhere. This, of course, is an individual decision and a very painful decision for the many of us who have spent much or most of our lives in California higher education, but we do not wish to mislead our colleagues by any false optimism regarding the future. The same political dynamics which produced hearings at which presidents and faculty were treated like sacrificial victims at a Roman spectacle can easily produce more phenomena of the same or worse calibre.

It takes years to build a great educational institution; it takes very little time to destroy it when once the forces of ignorance are loosed upon it through political means. Against attack of this sort the faculties have little defense, certainly no countervailing political power. They may, therefore, be forced back on the option of leaving, even though we all realize that the ultimate victims will be the many California students who will not receive the education they need and deserve.

2. We recognize our obligation to the people of California to hire the best possible faculty. It is an obligation we have faithfully discharged throughout many difficulties.

But we also recognize a duty to the profession and to the individuals whom we ask to come here. They must be told the truth. They must be told that the political climate in California is no longer friendly to the ideals of democratic higher education--nor to the professors who may carry on that tradition.

We must recommend that, in hiring professors for our system, those who do the hiring make perfectly clear what the situation is in the California State Colleges and what it may become.

- approved by the Academic Senate,
submitted by H. Haak, K. Sharkey,
J. Tidwell.

AZTEC SHOPS PRICING

A suspicion that the Aztec Shops Bookstore overprices textbooks required in course at San Diego State College was investigated by three graduate students in biology, David Damon, Tom Garrison, and Tom Niesen and me over the past month or so. Our research on this matter is by no means exhaustive, but is probably statistically significant.

We noted prices on sixty-three separate randomly (perhaps haphazardly) selected required textbooks at Aztec Shops, Cal-Book, and the publishers' list prices in *Books in Print*. The comparisons between Cal-Book and Aztec Shops are interesting only because they are so dull. In only four instances were any differences found at all between prices. In three of the four, Aztec Shops charges the higher price. We failed to find four of the books in our sample listed in *Books in Print*. In seven instances the publisher's list price was lower by anywhere from twenty-five cents to one dollar than the price at either bookstore. In one case the bookstores were offering a bargain.

While one might argue that prices ought to be lower, especially on required texts, or that a significant discount ought to be allowed students, one cannot demonstrate any significant difference between prices charged by the two sources most often used by our students.

- Albert W. Johnson

A DIALOGUE

A: Well, yes, there are flaws in the Warren Report, but this Garrison fellow . . . well, I mean, let's be sensible!

B: What's wrong with Garrison?

A: Well, the guy's a nut! He's a psychopath!

B: Why?

A: Look what he's saying! He's trying to find a conspiracy behind the whole thing! If he's not a psychopath, he's a self-seeking politician. Those are the only two possibilities.

B: I would like to suggest a third possibility.

A: What's that?

B: Before I go into that, let me ask you some questions. All right?

A: O.K.

B: When you say there are flaws in the Warren Report, do you mean to imply that the Report is substantially correct except for minor details?

A: Well, yes, I suppose so. For example, it's not possible, as the Report claims, that Governor Connally was wounded by the same bullet that hit the President. There's too much evidence against it. But then that's a rather trivial detail. I mean who cares, really, whether there were two bullets or one?

B: Are you aware that it has been demonstrated--most conclusively by Josiah Thompson in *Six Seconds in Dallas* that the second bullet followed the first one too quickly for both of them to have been fired from Oswald's rifle?

A: I have read something to that effect, yes.

B: What are the implications of this fact?

A: It strongly suggests that . . . well, that there were two gunmen instead of one.

B: Right. So now what do you say about the findings of the Warren Commission?

A: What do you mean?

B: Did not the Warren Commission conclude that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin?

A: O.K., O.K., I see what you mean. The Warren Report is substantially false, but the fact that there were two people involved doesn't mean that there was a whole conspiracy. Besides, Garrison says--

B: Wait a minute, wait a minute, now. You mean to say that you think that instead of one lone nut there were two lone nuts, who just happened to fire at the same point in space and time?

A: Well, no, I guess it's likely that they got together on it . . .

B: And if two people get together, isn't it just as probable that three or four can get together?

A: Well, yes, but it's harder. I mean, look at the trouble we have getting together in our committees, heh heh . . . O.K., I see your point. The inescapable conclusion is that it was a conspiracy, albeit a pretty small one in my opinion. Anyway, this still doesn't justify the wild activities of that flamboyant Garrison. Why, he's going around saying that elements of the C.I.A. are involved!

B: All right, let me ask a few questions about Garrison. He is a district attorney who has charged certain individuals with participation in a conspiracy to murder President Kennedy, right?

A: Right.

B: And we agree with him about there being a conspiracy?

A: Well, yes . . .

B: Then the only question is, does he have the right individuals?

A: Yes.

B: What's the best way to find out if he does or does not have the right individuals?

A: Let his case come to trial.

B: Do the defendants want the case to come to trial?

A: Apparently not. I understand that Clay Shaw's attorneys have managed to delay his trial four months already and may delay it several months, even years, in the future.

B: Do the news-media want the case to come to trial?

A: No, they seem to be more interested in discrediting Garrison. The editors of the *L.A. Times*, for example, printed classified medical information from Garrison's service record that had been leaked anonymously to the *Chicago Tribune* but refused to print any information on an important public speech made by Garrison in their own city of Los Angeles.

B: Does the Administration want the case to come to trial?

A: No, the order has reportedly come down from the Attorney General that government officials, particularly in the F.B.I. and the C.I.A., are not to co-operate with the district attorney's office in any way.

B: Very good. Your knowledge of the facts makes it easier for us to develop the logical implications of those facts.

A: Yes, I suppose so.

B: If Garrison is wrong, would it come out in the trial?

A: Yes, I have enough faith in our legal system to think so.

B: In fact, if Garrison is a psychopath as you suggested earlier, it would come out in the trial, wouldn't it?

A: I would certainly think so. I mean a psychopath is not likely to survive public exposure of that kind.

B: And if Garrison is a self-seeking politician, wouldn't that also be revealed in the trial?

A: Well, no. If he lost his case, he would be destroyed politically. So it would only prove that he was a *bad* politician.

B: And if he won? Would that merely prove that he was a good politician?

A: Sure. I mean . . . well.

B: It would also prove that he was right, wouldn't it?

A: Yes, I guess it would.

B: In any event, we agree that the trial would settle the matter, one way or the other?

A: Yes.

B: Then why doesn't the so-called Establishment want a trial?

A: I don't know.

B: All right, since I don't know either, let's try a hypothesis and see how it stands up.

A: All right.

B: Suppose Garrison is correct; suppose that some individuals who had been on the payroll of the C.I.A. were in on the conspiracy to murder the President.

A: All right, for the sake of argument I'll suppose it.

B: If this were generally known, wouldn't it lead to a drastic curtailment and perhaps total elimination of the C.I.A.?

A: Quite possibly, yes.

B: And isn't the C.I.A. considered by the Administration to be vital to our national security?

A: Yes.

B: Then the Administration would consider Garrison's investigation not merely an annoyance but a serious threat, wouldn't it?

A: A threat worth guarding against at all costs?

A: Yes.

B: Even at the cost of suppressing the truth?

A: Unfortunately, yes.

B: Even at the cost of *distorting* truth?

A: Well, yes.

B: Even at the cost of harassing, harming, or killing any individual threatening to expose the truth?

A: Wait a minute, now!

B: If the national security is felt to be at stake, wouldn't the life of one individual be considered a small price to pay?

A: I'm afraid you're right.

B: And the individual exposing the truth, how would he behave if faced with this situation?

A: If he were smart he would give up.

B: And if he persisted?

A: He'd be either a fool or . . .

B: Or?

A: A sincere, dedicated, and, I must say, courageous individual.

B: Well put. That's the third possibility I spoke of at the beginning.

A: Yes, I see, but all this is based on your hypothesis that elements of the C.I.A. are involved in the conspiracy.

B: Can you think of any other hypothesis that explains the way the Establishment is reacting?

A: Well . . . no. I can't.

B: And can't my hypothesis be tested empirically?

A: Yes, when the case comes to trial.

B: *If* the case comes to trial.

- P. S. Nichols

A FINAL REQUEST

To finish out the year, we must turn to the faculty again for contributions for *Advice & Dissent*. We want to ask those of you who like what we have done, who like what we are trying to do, and who hope that the faculty publication can continue, to send a contribution in the attached envelope to *Advice & Dissent*, Box 344.

-- Editors: M. Carella, C. Dicken, D. Johns, A.W. Johnson, K. Keller, J. W. Leasure

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Atwater, Joan. "Materials Are Tools," *Journal of Reading* (October, 1967).

_____. "Teachers and Campus Boily Boys," *New Directions in Teaching*, I, #2 (Spring, 1968).

_____. "Toward Meaningful Measurement," *Journal of Reading* (March, 1968).

Bas, Joe and Carter E. Dale. *Buenos argentinos de misterio*, an anthology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Coox, Alvin D. "L'affaire Lyushkov: Anatomy of a Defector," *Soviet Studies*, XIX (January, 1968), 405-420.

Widmer, Kingsley. "For the Mainline Market and Morality: Philip Roth," *Northwest Review* (Winter, 1968).

_____. "The Way Down to Wisdom of Louis-Ferdinand Celine," *Minnesota Review* (Winter, 1968).

_____. "The Way Out: Some Life-Style Sources of the Literary Tough Guy," in *Tough-Guy Literature of the Thirties*, ed. David Madden. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.

_____. "Report on the Iron Heads" (discussing *Report From Iron Mountain* and anti-war writings), *Peace News* (March, 1968).

_____. "The Sweet and Savage Prophecies of Nathanael West," in *The Thirties*, ed. Warren French. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Press, 1967.

_____. "Milton's Iconography of Renunciation," in *Milton's Epic Poetry*, ed. C. A. Patrides. London: Penguin Books, 1967; reprinted 1968.

_____. "Melville's Perplexity: Benito Cereno," *Studies in Short Fiction* (Spring, 1968).

_____. "Melville's Perplexity: Billy Budd," in *Novel: Forum on Fiction*. Providence: Brown University Press, 1968.

_____. "The Rebellious Culture: Some Radical Reflections on the Current Scene," *West Coast Review* (1968). Originally an address at the University of British Columbia, December, 1967.

_____. *The Literary Rebel*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, reprinted 1967.

THE DEMISE OF SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING AT SAN DIEGO STATE

Recently a slightly used computer, an IBM 360/Model 40, was delivered to campus. It was acquired in haste: the decision to purchase on a five-year contract was made in less than a week. As far as I can ascertain, advice concerning the purchase was not requested from any faculty member or outside expert familiar with scientific computing. Certainly the computer program committee, appointed by President Love to serve as an advisory committee on academic computer matters, was not informed of the plans until after the decision had already been made.

The present computer on campus is an IBM 1620. The acquired 360 is 50 to 150 times faster in the execution of single commands. It has COBOL capacity. Its peripheral equipment includes such desirable features as a high-speed printer and magnetic tape units. In addition, the hasty decision to purchase saved the State of California \$150,000, since another state agency had had it for almost two years and had paid in that amount towards its purchase. It looked like a bargain in the computing power that San Diego State desperately needs, and well-intentioned, overworked administrators apparently did not inquire further but concentrated efforts on raising the necessary funding for the machine.

Perhaps if an expert on scientific computing had been consulted, he could have given some warnings. Those acquainted with scientific computing in San Diego are well aware that knowledgeable institutions like the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, UCSD, and Convair do not use an IBM 360 for scientific computing. And with good reason. Let's take FORTRAN capability, since it is generally agreed that it is a waste of time to program scientific programs in any lower level language. The largest integer than one can use in FORTRAN programming for the 360 is 2,147,483,647; for the IBM 1620 it is 9,999,999,999. The largest floating point constant in FORTRAN for the 360 is approximately 10^{75} ; for the 1620 it is approximately 10^{97} . When executing FORTRAN programs, the 360 has an accuracy at single precision of at most seven digits and at double precision of at most 16 digits. For comparison, one can obtain accuracy with the aid of a single control card of up to 28 digits with FORTRAN programming on the 1620. So if you have a problem which may demand too much accuracy, you are out of luck; forget about programming it in FORTRAN for the 360/40. (Incidentally, if you have a program written in SPS or machine language which you've been running on the 1620, forget it too; it won't run on the 360 and the 1620 will not be here.)

Non-numerical scientific programming is apparently just as bad on the IBM 360. Let's consider research currently being worked on by a faculty member in artificial intelligence. This research requires a syntactical analysis of strings of characters and is best done with the aid of a list-processing language such as LISP or SLIP. These languages are not listed as available with the IBM 360/40. When I asked the IBM representative about their availability, he did not seem to know what a list-processing language was. Effective on July 1, 1969, Western Data Processing Center will no longer allow San Diego State faculty members to do research on its computers without payment. At this time, it is not clear that any unpaid-for research will be allowed on the campus IBM 360. It is quite possible that a faculty member will have no access to any high-speed electronic computer for his research unless he has a grant or is otherwise funded. Under these conditions I do not see how (or why) anyone seriously interested in scientific computing would be attracted to San Diego State.

The situation concerning the scientific programming courses is up in the air also. The IBM 1620 was used between sixteen to eighteen hours a day, mostly for instructional purposes. Test runs indicate that the 360/40 compiles and executes a student program about three times faster than the 1620. The projection is that it would take about five hours a day to handle the current instructional load on the 1620. No one in authority will definitely say what amount of instructional computing time will be available in the fall, but the maximum figure most often mentioned has been between three to four hours. If student usage is restricted to this figure, and the tests are reliable, a quick calculation indicates that, unless student programming efforts are diluted drastically, a 20% decrease in student enrollment in programming courses will be required.

All of this comes at the time when the amount of student programming should be increased rather than decreased. One government report estimates that a university of 15,000 students should be spending \$900,000 a year by 1971 on computing for instructional purposes alone. It is anticipated that any university of that size which does not plan to spend that much by 1971 is and will be second-rate, if not lower. It will simply not be competitive in the quality of education acquired by the students, since many concepts in science, engineering, business, and education can be taught better and quicker with appropriate "computer" homework. The need is particularly great in science and engineering courses. But there is still that silver lining of the \$150,000 saving. And as a bitter colleague of mine said, if we continue the way we are going, we might be able to eliminate altogether student and faculty scientific computing and save that cost too.

-- C. R. Burton

ADVICE

+

DISSENT

BOX

344